

REMARKS

Claim 1 was limited to provide a functional limitation that the substituents are selected so that of the color produced in a device is within the claimed range. Support may be found at page 5 /line 21 of the specification. Claim 7 is amended to make it independent, to incorporate the pertinent limitations of claim 1, and to make a correction in the wording.

Claims 1, 5-9, 11-12, 14, 18-26, and 28-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato et al. (JP 04-335087). According to the Examiner:

Sato et al. discloses an organic electroluminescent element comprising a light-emitting hole injecting and transporting layer comprising a dopant naphthacene derivative according to formula (I) that comprises a substituent group such as an aromatic ring that may be substituted with alkoxy groups or halogen groups (see Sato abstract). Although Sato et al. does not exemplify compounds with oxy groups according to the claimed formulas, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have selected alkoxy-containing naphthacene derivatives for the Sato et al. device according to the presently claimed compounds, because Sato et al. generally teaches all the required substituents for naphthacene derivatives according to the instant claims. Because the Sato et al. naphthacene derivatives may have all the same substituents required by the presently claimed dopant compounds, the properties set forth in claims 28, 33, and 34 are deemed to be inherently met by the Sato et al. compound(s)....

It is noted that Comparison Comp-1 through Comp-4 at page 41 of the specification appear to be within the Teachings of Sato. To be specific, Comp -1, Comp-2 and Comp-3 of the present specification correspond to Sato compounds 1, 3, and 4. According to the data in Tables 1-3, beginning at page 41 of the specification, the substituents are not sufficient to provide $570\text{nm} < \lambda_{\text{max}} \leq 650\text{nm}$ and most of them are deficient in luminance efficiency. By contrast, the compounds included within the invention exhibit the desired maximum absorption and are generally comparable or better in efficiency.

It is not believed that the present invention is obvious over the cited reference. Three examples from among the references best were unable to

provide properties comparable to the compounds selected for the present invention. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the outstanding rejection in light of the foregoing amendments and remarks and to pass the subject application to Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Kluegel', written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 25,518

Arthur E. Kluegel/dlm
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-477-2625
Facsimile: 585-477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.